

VOLUME 6.

NUMBER 5

PRICE 1/-

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for May, 1965

SPAIN TO-DAY	<i>Hugh Kay</i>
CHINA IN AFRICA	<i>Observer</i>
B.B.C. AND PUBLIC	<i>The Editor</i>
GOODNESS ESCALATES!	<i>Vincent Rochford</i>
THE WORKING POOR	<i>J. M. Jackson</i>
BETTER THAN DREAMS	<i>E. L. Way</i>

Contents

Page

257 BBC AND PUBLIC

The Editor

259 THE CHRISTIAN LIFE:

GOODNESS ESCALATES!

Vincent Rochford

263 CURRENT COMMENT:

CHINA IN AFRICA—1

Observer

273 BETTER THAN DREAMS

E L Way

278 MONTHLY REPORT:

SPAIN TODAY

Hugh Kay

288 THE WORKING POOR

J. M. Jackson

297 ANY QUESTIONS?

William Lawson, S.J.

302 LEARNING FROM THE COMMUNISTS

— 3

Douglas Hyde

317 BOOK REVIEW

Paul Crane, S.J.

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:

If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Fur-nival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Brighton Terrace, Bray.

Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who till now have bought Christian Order each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 6.

MAY, 1965

NUMBER 5.

B.B.C. and Public

THE EDITOR

PUBLIC opinion has been roused during past months by a particularly offensive B.B.C. broadcast. The reaction was entirely justified. The verdict pronounced on it by the Earl of Longford in the House of Lords was one with which all men of good will would find themselves in entire agreement. In the words of a *Times* leader, "It is evident from more than one exhibition of coarse taste that the difference between what may fittingly be done in television and what is tolerated by patrons of a third rate night club is not understood by some of those responsible for B.B.C. programmes". It is time that it was and the public should continue to protest until it is.

In the case of a good many viewers, the broadcast in question served the additional purpose of providing them with an outlet through which the mounting discontent of months could find appropriate expression. It is not merely a question of the sick humour indulged in by so many performers. More insidious are the selective moralising to which commentators are prone, the partisan way in which world affairs are presented (I am thinking particularly of the struggle in South Vietnam), the instant and facile judgments on matters way beyond their competence in which interviewers encourage their subjects to indulge. We live at a time when a pop queen's verdict on world affairs is treated with respect or a comedian's opinion of family values thought worthy of attention.

There is no easy way to stop this nonsense. Liberals of the Lilac Establishment are far more partisan in their selection of personnel and programmes, more dedicated to the advancement of progressive friends and theories than their liberal profession of faith would have us believe. One has the impression of a clique in control, excluding all from the business of mass communications except those—their friends of like opinion—whom they consider it good for the “masses” to see and hear. In the interests of progressive ideals all but progressives should be kept from contact with the people over the air. It would be wrong to score this line as deliberate policy. It is better described, perhaps, as a subconscious habit of mind, which has now become a way of life. What it has meant and continues to mean for most of us is that there is only one predominating voice on the B.B.C. It belongs to the progressive, anti-establishment, self-sufficient, secularist Left.

One is not calling here for the exclusion of this voice, merely that it should be balanced by others less wedded to progressive clichés than it appears to be itself. It would be enlightening, for example, to listen to a commentary on South Vietnam that did not regard the Americans as a pack of fools for being there at all; that did not regard their bombing of the North as aggression, but as defensive action against a build-up of aggression by the North that has been going on for years, that was not so quick to assume that all Buddhists were heroes and the South Vietnamese, as a people, sick of the war. Nearer home, it would be wonderful to let the cameras play on the happiness of a large, outsize Catholic family (I could give the B.B.C. two wonderful examples), be treated to a little less dreary talk of the population explosion and given more of the encouraging measures taken in so many parts of the world to meet it with appropriate investment measures. So many suggestions could be made in the same direction. Until they are given the consideration they deserve, viewers who believe in the decencies of life have only one option: they must continue to protest.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

We have read much recently of the dangers of escalation. We are warned that step by step we may be approaching doomsday. But there are other trends. In this article our thoughts are turned towards an 'escalation of goodness', and shown how much of love and tolerance has come from the example of one old man.

Goodness Escalates!

VINCENT ROCHFORD

THE eyes of the world are on Vietnam, for the situation there is full of danger. Infiltration from abroad, ambushes, bomb explosions on the one side; on the other, aerial bombing of bases and supply routes. This in turn could tempt the first side to mount, with foreign help, large-scale air raids; and these in turn might provoke the use of tactical nuclear weapons, and, in the last resort, someone, somehow, might employ megaton bombs. Thus violence begets violence, on an ascending scale, and the cliché we use for such a process is "escalation".

It is not only physical violence that "escalates". Moral evil follows the same trend. Once embarked on a wrong course, how often we are driven by the logic of events to further evil. The thief is driven to lying, then to laying the blame on someone else. Meanwhile bad example spreads. The child whose brother or class-mate slides out of trouble by telling lies soon learns to imitate him. The mother who takes the easy way out with the children is soon copied by the father. The business man doing well on an expense account breeds imitators; the official who gives out contracts without accepting bribes is a standing discouragement to his fellow whose standard of living remains permanently lower because of his integrity. The union official who battles only for justice is often tempted

to descend to the emotional diatribes which gain cheap applause. The teenager who often sees thugs on the T.V. putting a foot in against a prostrate victim finds it more difficult to confine himself to honest fists; and this in turn incites members of the other gang to use flick-knives and bicycle chains. All through history the moralist has emphasised this tendency, and everyone's experience of life has taught him the same.

Is Goodness Catching?

But it works the other way, though the movement often passes unnoticed. Goodness provokes self-questioning, it stimulates emulation, it can set in motion a whole trend.

It is a short time since the days of good Pope John, who startled us all by his broad vision, his courage, his optimistic appeal to what is good in every man, no matter what his philosophy of life. His reception of the Soviet leader's son-in-law in the Vatican itself was perhaps the highlight of his policy.

The simple, open-hearted goodness of that man struck a chord in the heart of all humanity. To a world sick of hatred, of strife, of violence, of war, it brought doubts and self-questionings about its own activities and attitudes. Ingrained enmities, bigotries, rancours and suspicions yielded under the impact of one prominent man's holiness. His example travelled far and wide. It affected men normally quite immune from any papal influence.

How far, we may already see. John's personal influence and the effect of the Vatican Council, which is in a very special sense his own Council, has had a world-wide effect.

Thus we find General Franco, leader of proud Spain, hitherto entrenched behind the Pyrenees, living in the climate of the Counter-reformation, coming out in favour of religious liberty. "If Spain has always been in the vanguard of all peoples in spreading the Gospel, we are not going to stay in the rear of this crusade of fraternity and love that the Church is undertaking," he declared on 31st December, 1964.

About the same time a Portuguese bishop wrote openly in favour of the freedom of the press.

Italian Catholics, whose religion has been so closely bound up since the war with anti-communism, welcome a Socialist and Marxist president !

On the other side, Yugo-Slav Communism no longer demands that members of the party should renounce the Catholic faith !

In Religious Circles

The present Pope embraces an Orthodox patriarch on the mount of Olives. He returns the head of St. Andrew the apostle to them. A year later the patriarch sends an affectionate and fraternal letter to the Bishop of Rome !

South American Catholics unite in a crusade to fight for social justice for the poverty-stricken millions !

Even in Catholic circles Pope John brings a revolution. A United States' archbishop who is also a cardinal sets up a diocesan council of the laity, thus entering into dialogue with his people. Normally a bishop meets only wealthy benefactors of Catholic causes, or leading figures in Catholic organisations. He has little chance of understanding what the little Catholic man in the back street is thinking. His mail consists mostly of letters from cranks, for the average Catholic doesn't dream of writing a letter to his bishop. Here, from U.S.A., comes a little gleam of light and of hope that the closed clerical world may be accessible, may even seek contact, with the ordinary little man who fills the pew and pays his dues and brings credit on his faith in his factory and street. This is new, it is a novel feature for over a thousand years: and it is an escalation from good Pope John's example.

Not least is the new ecumenical climate. History had left us feeling a sense of injustice. We had been persecuted and slandered by the other side. We felt no desire to know anything about their beliefs, their outlook and religious practices. They were our rivals, misleading souls from the One True Church. Each side was anxious to score points off the other. For them the fires of Smithfield still burned, they felt relief at living in a land where neither Gestapo nor Inquisition could lay hands on them. On our side, Henry VIII was hardly dead,

and much of the theology we had could not leave Luther alone. The world grew rapidly more pagan all around us whilst we continued our little sectarian controversies.

Discovering Our Brothers

Quite suddenly Pope John drew our attention, forcibly, dramatically, by his actions more than by his speeches, away from what divides Christians. He made us dwell on what unites them. He led us to reflect that hurdles and gallows have not been used against any of us in this century! On the contrary we get a very fair deal from our fellow-citizens. We contract out of social and civic occasions, out of the public school system, we spoil the uniformity of administration that any government prefers, most of our social failures are left to the attention of anyone or no one; and we constantly draw attention to our superiority rather than apologising for our mediocrity and unworthiness in spite of all the help we have at our disposal from Christ our Lord.

Pope John made us notice the profound unity we share with other communions. For we all acknowledge the fatherhood of God, all confess that Jesus is our Lord and Saviour, all accept the Word of God, all benefit from the sacrament of baptism.

And to-day non-Catholic ministers of religion bring their people to Mass for the unity of Christians in our churches, whilst we go down to them to join in evensong or a Bible service. There is a new appreciation of the sincerity, goodness, and holiness to be found in all communions.

All this new drive towards unity, in the political and religious spheres, leaves plenty of separations, misunderstandings and fears. But it all adds up to a new appreciation of the underlying unity of the human race, to a willingness to seek bridges, to look for what we share in common, to accept only with regret what divides. There is an escalation of goodness as well as of evil. Nothing in our lifetime affords us so much encouragement in our effort to live as Christians, to bear witness to Christ and carry out an apostolate, as this current of goodness and love released by one old man.

CURRENT COMMENT

In this and next month's issue of *Christian Order*, "Current Comment" is turned over to an acute observer of the African scene, who must remain anonymous. His theme is the present extent of Chinese Communist penetration in Africa.

China in Africa : 1

OBSERVER

DURING recent months, objections have been raised in a number of African countries against the present extent of Chinese Communist infiltration and subversion within the African continent. China's present disregard of African wishes in this respect is clear enough from an editorial in the *People's Daily* for June 24th, 1964. The article described the revolt in the Kwilu Province of the Congo as enjoying Peking's support. It went on to add that, "The present state of affairs is exactly right for the revolutionary struggle of the Congolese people". Communist China continues its campaign to draw Africa into its sphere of influence despite the strongly expressed wishes to the contrary of President Ben Bella of Algeria. He said, not so long ago, that he did not wish his own country to become "at any price a field for clashes or a reward in a fight which strikes us, from time to time, as aggravating, to say the very least" Ben Bella is not alone. Most of Africa's developing countries have stated that they do not wish to become involved in the Cold War or the Sino-Soviet quarrel. Despite this expressed desire, the Chinese Communists never hesitate to make use of diplomatic missions, propaganda and cultural exchanges, aid and military training programmes as a means of African infiltration.

Chinese Communist Ambition

With this end in view, Communist China tried, in the

first instance, to make use of the idea of Afro-Asian solidarity and supposed racial affinity. As the Sino-Soviet quarrel developed a new objective appeared. The number one target for the Red Chinese is not now that of excluding the influence of the free world from Africa. China's present concern is that she herself and not the Soviet Union should direct and inspire the advance of Communism across Africa. In effect, Chinese Communism teaches that colonial countries need violent revolution as an instrument of liberation. The Soviet Union is accused of neo-colonialism on the grounds that it gives aid on a temporary basis¹ to "bourgeois" movements of national liberation. Whatever the truth of this, it is clear that, in what concerns Africa, there exists a great identity of interest as well as strong competition between Moscow and Peking. At the same time—and as a strategic measure—Chou-en-Lai favours a strict delimitation of competing interests in order that the communist cause in Africa may be promoted as rapidly as possible. At present, Communist China is concerned mainly with the countries of East and Central Africa. Apart from anything else, China has in the former area what might be described as a second theatre of operations against India. It is the Indians who hold major economic power on the East African coast. For this very reason it is easy to stir up the Africans against them and to cast oneself in the role of liberator of the African people from the Indian "capitalist yoke". Moreover, the control of the ports on Africa's eastern seaboard would provide Communist China with a major strategic advantage. As a provisional policy, then, Peking is concentrating on East and Central Africa, whilst Moscow takes the West and North. At the same time, and despite the division, Communist China is actively preparing bridgeheads for the second stage of her African

¹It is worth pointing out at this stage that the concept of peaceful co-existence, as understood nowadays and practised by the Soviet Union, in no way implies any abandonment of traditional communist objectives. The *immediate* objective of this policy is the establishment of neutralism: this frame of mind will then be worked on and emasculated with a view to the *ultimate* domination of the world by communism. The Kremlin chiefs are quite explicit with regard to this objective.

adventure at Bamako in Mali and Algiers. China's revolutionary probings everywhere have, in fact, been stepped up ever since Chou-en-Lai's visit to that Continent in January, 1964. He then said that "the prospects of revolution were excellent all over Africa". Red China seems determined now to exploit these prospects wherever they are to be found.

One would have to be very naive to believe that Chou's revolutionary prospects appeared spontaneously, so to say, on the African scene. The Communists, after all, are past masters of the art of creating situations favourable to revolution; experts in the business of exploiting difficult situations and stirring them up to the point where explosion is inevitable. Here their guide is the strategy laid down by Lenin in a famous passage of *The Infantile Malady of Communism*: "It is necessary to carry on agitation and systematic propaganda, perseveringly and persistently. One must know how to make use of every kind of stratagem, trick and clandestine action, one must know how to remain silent, conceal the truth and agree to all the indispensable compromise, harrying and subterfuge, in order to hasten the inevitable frictions, disputes and conflicts". Guided by the Leninist policy of subversion, the Communists for some years now have been exploiting selected difficult situations in Africa. They have done everything in their power to bring them to the point of explosion. In this and a subsequent article, the story is confined to the subversive activities of the Chinese.

A Beginning is Made

The penetration of Africa by Russian Communism only began in 1955. Chinese efforts are still more recent. At the end of 1959, they decided to set up a whole crop of organisations which would enable them, at one and the same time, to study African problems from a communist angle and forge close links between the newly independent countries of Africa and Peking. Initial contacts between Chinese Communists and African leaders had been established from the time of the Bandung Conference onwards: this took place in April, 1955. During the following four

years, the Chinese were increasingly active on the African continent. Fifty Chinese delegations, whose membership totalled four hundred, visited friendly African States; at the same time, these sent to Red China one hundred and fifty delegations comprising in all seven hundred people, who either belonged to the government of their countries or were experts on matters that concerned youth, economics, trade, agriculture and science. In the same period, branches of the New China Agency were being set up, if they did not already exist, in various capital cities of Africa: the personnel of the Agency were engaged for the most part in activities which it would be accurate to describe as alien to usual journalistic practice.

During the whole of this initial period from 1955-1959, Peking had neither high-level organisers nor experts in subversion to assist with the work of penetrating Africa. Lacking any real knowledge of Africa's problems, Chinese Communism had to restrict its method of operation to the lines laid down by the Movement for Afro-Asian Solidarity of which it was a member. During these years, therefore, Chinese propaganda which found its way into Africa did not have a specifically African slant.

The Second Stage

In 1959, the Chinese Communists became very conscious of the extraordinary and rapid changes that were taking place in Africa. They felt the need to co-ordinate their work in that continent. Consequently, at the end of 1959 and the beginning of 1960, there took place at Peking a series of meetings which brought together most of the important Chinese Communists who, in one way or another, were concerned with Africa. A department was also created in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to supervise Chinese activities in Africa. Next, came a spate of specific organisations.

In April, 1960 there was announced the establishment of The Friendship Association of the Peoples of China and Africa. This was followed, a month later, by the Committee for the support of the Afro-Asian Freedom Movement, whose purpose was to give political and, even, military aid.

In October, 1960, the African department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, already referred to, was transformed into a Directorate of African Affairs. At the same time, there was set up a Commission for Cultural Relations with Africa. In January, 1961 came the Committee for the study of African Affairs, then an African Institute, like that of Moscow, for the study of African problems from an historical, ethnic and linguistic, point of view. Also, at the beginning of 1961, there was established a Chinese People's Committee for the Aid of African Countries against Aggression. Finally, on the occasion of the seventh anniversary of the Bandung Conference, there was established at Peking, in April, 1962, an Afro-Asian Society of China. The object of the Society was made known in the inaugural addresses of Chen-Yu, the Deputy Prime Minister, and Kuo-Mo-Jo, President of the Academy of Sciences. It was to promote and organise in the Chinese People's Republic, study and research concerning the political and economic problems, history, philosophy, languages, literature, arts, religion and social conditions of the countries of Africa and Asia. Its aim was to increase cultural exchanges. In actual fact, the foundation of this Society meant the setting up of a vast political apparatus intended to co-ordinate the numerous facets of Chinese infiltration into Africa. The Afro-Asian Society of China now controls the embassies, consulates, agencies and the many economic and cultural missions of communist China in Africa. It supervises also and directs the education of African students studying in the Chinese People's Republic.

Propaganda

Radio is an obvious means chosen by Communism for the spread of propaganda throughout the African continent. Transmissions from Radio Moscow to black Africa were first begun in April, 1958. Those from Radio Peking began a few months later. Since then, broadcasts have continually increased. In October, 1964, Chinese broadcasts to Africa totalled ninety-eight hours a week². Broadcasts are in

²In July, 1964, broadcasts abroad from various Communist countries amounted to 4,375 hours a week, of which 350 were aimed at black Africa.

French, English, Arabic, Portuguese, Italian, Swahili, Amharic and Cantonese (for Chinese residents of East Africa and Madagascar). Recently, Radio Peking announced in Swahili that three daily broadcasts on new frequencies would be relayed to Africa. The principal object of all this radio activity is to support the subversive activities of Red China, now being intensified throughout the African countries. A special characteristic of these Chinese broadcasts is their violent tone. They consist mainly of repeated attacks against "colonialists" and "imperialists", particularly Americans.

Another form of propaganda consists in the diffusion throughout Africa of hundreds of thousands of brochures, books, articles and other types of publication made up of communist propaganda. In many African cities and towns libraries and reading centres have been established where Africans can obtain at ridiculously low prices periodicals, newspapers and records edited from Peking: very often, of course, these publications are distributed free. In countries where they are banned they are posted directly to private addresses. It is, however, the correspondents in Africa of the New China Agency who have the special task of spreading throughout Africa propaganda in favour of Communist China and retailing back to Peking local African news, which is then given major publicity over the NCA network. This technique is designed very specially to influence public opinion in the neutralist countries.

Finally — and still at the propaganda level — Communist China organises travelling exhibitions in the African countries with which it has diplomatic relations. Photographs, drawings, statistics, models, etc. are displayed before African audiences, which are completely unaware as a rule of the appalling conditions in Communist China and, in particular, of the recent failure of its planned agricultural effort and the famine that came in its train.

"Diplomats" at Large

None of the propaganda activities we have been discussing would have any real value without their connection with the various embassies, news agencies, diplomatic and

consular offices, economic and cultural missions already set up by Communist China in Africa. These form bases from which the agents of Communist China spread their subversive activity throughout Africa. This is a relatively late development. In March, 1958 the Peking Government had established diplomatic relations with only one African country, the United Arab Republic. Today, it has representatives accredited to sixteen African governments. Chinese diplomats, assisted by correspondents of the New China Agency, have become more and more involved in underground activities against the African governments who are their hosts. Suspicions concerning the origin of the mutinies in East Africa at the beginning of 1964 led the Governments of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania to limit to ten the personnel of diplomatic missions and that of news agencies to one. This restriction operated for the first time against six Chinese who landed at Nairobi airport in January, 1964 to join the Chinese Embassy, which already had a staff of twelve. In the *Nigerian Daily Telegraph* of September 28th, 1964, Mr. Kavani recalled that communist China supported five centres of subversion in Africa at Algiers, Bamako, Brazzaville, Bujumbura and Dar-es-Salaam. Lack of "diplomat-agitators" able to speak the local language and "a close watch on embassies by the governments concerned" impeded subversive activities sponsored by the embassies of Communist China at Tunis, Rabat, Kampala, Nairobi and Khartoum. "But", Mr. Kavani continued "this is only the calm before the storm". By the end of last year Peking hoped to set up embassies in Senegal, Nigeria, Dahomey, Zambia and the Central African Republic.

Base at Burundi

It is not surprising that, since Dar-es-Salaam has become the centre for many African liberation movements, the Chinese should have appointed a high-ranking ambassador to Tanzania. Ho Ying, who is there now, is considered to be an African expert. He was in on the creation of the Department of African Affairs in Peking. Wang Yu-tien, who replaced Ho Ying in the Department, is now Chinese Ambassador to Kenya. Burundi used to provide another

good base for the Chinese Communists*. In January, 1964 a diplomatic mission was established and the first chargé d'affaires was Yiang Chen. Three years before, when in Indonesia, this diplomat had been kept under close observation by the authorities because of attempts he made to obstruct the government deportation of Chinese residents. Tung Chi-ping, a cultural attaché to the mission, who later defected to the West, has stated that the Chinese were only interested in Burundi as a stepping stone to the Congo. Kao Liang, the representative of the New China Agency at Dar-es-Salaam, often visits Burundi. Some years ago, the Indian authorities asked for his removal from India because of his tendentious, biased and groundless reports and observations. Visits of Kao Liang to Burundi were apparently to collect reportage for the New China Agency. In fact, he used them to maintain contact with (Watutsi) refugees from Rwanda, who have received material help from the Chinese. At first sight, it seems contrary to Marxist principles that Chinese Communists in Burundi should give backing to refugees from Rwanda whose aim is the restoration in that tiny country of its previous feudal system, whereby the Watutsi ruled over a serf tribe, the Hutu, who are now in charge of Rwanda. Anyone, however, who is acquainted with "the Communist art of strategy and tactic", as taught by Lenin, knows very well that, in such a case as this, there is only an apparent contradiction. Until their recent expulsion from Burundi, Chinese Communists granted *provisional* aid to the refugees from Rwanda in order to widen the gap prevailing between the peoples of that country. In this, they have shown themselves faithful followers of *Lenin*. In *The Infantile Malady of Communism* he wrote: "To forbid all exploitation of antagonistic interests (even if these should be passing) which divide our enemies and all agreement and compromise with temporary allies, isn't this absolutely ridiculous? For the art of tactics is to conceal up to the last minute the strategic goal".

*The Chinese diplomatic mission was expelled from Burundi following the assassination on January 16th, 1965, of the anti-Communist Prime Minister, Pierre Ngendandumwe. The Chinese were considered responsible for this brutal murder.

Setback in Malawi

Not long ago, an effort made by Communist China to spread its influence in Africa met with a setback. Doctor Banda, Prime Minister of Malawi, stated on September 8th, 1964, that Communist China had offered him £18,000,000 in return for the recognition by his Government of Peking. According to Doctor Banda, the offer came from the Chinese Embassy in Dar-es-Salaam. Commenting next day on the Doctor's statement, an editorial in the *East African Standard* said, "A third of the forty-eight Chinese Embassies are to be found in Africa. Among all these embassies the most important is that in Dar-es-Salaam. For Africa's own good, Africans must bear in mind the warnings sounded by recent events on the West and East coasts, in the Congo, in Burundi, in Southern Rhodesia and now in Malawi". Soon after Doctor Banda made public the Chinese offer and the ministerial intrigue against him with which it was connected, Mr. Shikulu, General Secretary of what was then KADU in Kenya, called for the closure of the Chinese Embassy in Nairobi and the expulsion of its staff. He criticised the Embassy for making public a statement attacking Mr. Tshombe's Government in the Congo: he maintained that the statement was a fraud when one took into account Red China's support of the Congolese revolt. Mr. Shikulu warned his countrymen: "If the Chinese can infiltrate the Congo, they can also infiltrate here". He added that he had it in mind to draw Mr. Kenyatta's attention to the threat presented by the Chinese to the peaceful development of Kenya.

Guerilla Training

Support given by Communist China to revolutionary movements in Africa is by no means limited to propaganda. Red China offers to "nationalists" engaged in civil war or preparing for it instruction based on her own long experience of guerilla warfare. Brochures are provided for men on the spot and there are, in addition, training courses in China. In 1960, it was found that six citizens of the Cameroons, when arrested, had well-filled notebooks and brochures based on a ten-week training course which they

had followed in a military academy near Peking. Classes dealt with the manufacture of explosives, mines and grenades, their use for sabotage, the handling of more complicated military weapons, and methods of political instruction. In 1960, the delegate from the Cameroons to the United Nations stated: "Information obtained by the Government of the Republic shows that many young men from the Cameroons, attracted to China under false pretences, receive psychological and military training for the sole object of being sent back to our national territory to engage in subversive activities and become instructors with a view to a future general revolution". China is active also in Portuguese Africa. It was announced in August, 1963, that an unspecified number of those belonging to the African Party for the Independence of Portuguese Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands (PAIGC) had been following in China six-month courses in guerilla warfare. Radio Leopoldville confirmed, on October 20th, 1964, that guerilla training camps had been established in the Congo at Kamu, near Leopoldville, Impfondo and Bouanga. The last named is an establishment where "indoctrination and military training are given to rebels in groups of 100 and 150". The broadcast added that the revolutionary situation in the whole of the Congo was under the control of an expert in guerilla warfare and subversion based on the Chinese Embassy at Brazzaville. The London *African Review*, in its issue for November, 1964, revealed the expert as Colonel Kan Mai. Here at Brazzaville, the Chinese Embassy, which was established in February, 1964, has a staff of at least twenty, complete with military attachés. These latter help with the training of Congolese rebels in special camps at Gambona and Impando in the old French Congo. Assisting them are Congolese African instructors recently returned from Peking. Courses began there in 1961. The Chinese Embassy at Brazzaville is providing in addition training, arms, munitions and money for the rebels within the old Belgian Congo itself.

(To be concluded)

Knowledge of missed opportunities in the past which have led to the Church losing the working classes should alert us to the dangers and the great possibilities of the present. The setting up of forums in the parishes where the real co-operation of the laity must be won could well be a beginning. At the moment the most elementary grievances cannot be put right.

Better than Dreams

E. L. WAY

READING Gregor Siefer's book *The Church and Industrial Society*, I was instructed, uplifted, dismayed and exhilarated by turns. As the reader will remember it is "a survey of the Worker-Priest Movement and its implication for the Christian Mission". And in part two dealing with the sequence of events the writer gives an outline history of the Church's mission to the working classes in France. In reading this section one is saddened by the opportunities missed, the very little that was so often attempted too late, and thoroughly dismayed by the crass incomprehension of the many when they dealt with the noble efforts of the very few. Who would dream now, for example, of mistrusting, insulting, maliciously criticising and hampering the Society of St. Vincent de Paul? Yet Ozanam, beatified in 1960, wrote in a letter in 1838 that "There's no denying that the Society has met with mistrust everywhere. Even if it has received no reprimand from the Church authorities in Lyons — if, in fact, some worthy priests there have actually encouraged it—it has been the object of malicious criticism from many of the laity . . . the amateur doctors of theology who make *ex-cathedra* pronouncements over their morning paper, or their ledgers, or after a good dinner; people to whom every new arrival is an unwelcome one and everything which comes from Paris is wicked; who make their political opinions a thirteenth article of the

Faith, and who say, modestly putting themselves in the place of our Lord Jesus: "He who is not with me is against me" — you cannot imagine the petty malice, quibbles, hair-splitting and insults to which these people have treated us, of course all in the best of faith! . . . Still we must not complain, since we have to contend with a world which could even condemn a Lacordaire!"

Missed Opportunity

The author, Gregor Siefer, notes that with Ozanam another man "Had seen the same things and in many cases spoken the same words in the same place and about the same period". That man was Karl Marx. If the world at large has forgotten, or never even heard of Ozanam and instead has made Marx one of the founding fathers of the modern world, the fault surely lies with the amateur theologians, "the top dogs of orthodoxy, the conciliar Fathers in frock coats and top hats" berated by Ozanam. They frowned on Ozanam, and his like, because he was trying to make the world a better place than the one we have inherited! Like the Christians of St. Augustine's time have we not tried, perhaps, to hang on too tightly to a world in obvious decline? Instead of trying to baptize and Christianise capitalism should we not rather have tried to spread our roots among the 'new barbarians': the so-called proletariat, the masses, the working classes?

Liberty

In the most worthwhile attempt to preserve liberty, to safeguard the rights of property, on both of which we struggle and thrive, we seem to have overlooked the fact that the majority of men, for the greater part of history, have possessed little of either. Mgr. Blanchet, Rector of the Institut Catholique, with this fact in mind in 1953 quoted words spoken by Lacordaire in 1834: "Of what use is liberty to the poor man, since he is excluded from everything . . . Money is the means to everything, the price, the measure of everything. And the poor man has no money. This being so how can the problem of freedom fail to resolve into a kind of civil war between the haves and have-nots?" And an

acrimonious civil war we shall continue to have. The loss of the Christian faith by the working classes in England has been put down to many factors: the complete breakdown of the parish system with the herding of millions as factory fodder into the nearest big towns with the coming of the industrial age. It was also due to the identification of the clergy with the employers. "They (the clergy) always sided with the bosses against us". The only 'just' strike in recent times seems to have been the Belgian doctor's strike! The class bias in such 'judgments' is obvious. In the French Revolution the priests were not hated as priests but as landed proprietors and tithe collectors.

Past

All this is past history. It should not be lamented over. We must not emulate Lot's wife and, by grieving over what can't be undone, turn into pillars of salt. We should learn from our mistakes. And the chief lesson, it seems to me, is that those in power must be much more in contact, in communication, in dialogue with those who have their ears to the ground, those who know the needs of the time, those who are in the thick of the fight for the soul of modern man. An institution ruled over by a hierarchy is in permanent danger of seizing up, of being clogged and choked if it is not open to the scouring, cleansing, bracing and tonic winds of criticism.

Example

As as an ordinary layman of little importance, whose opinion theologically speaking is insignificant and negligible, I find a dispute suddenly blowing up in various Catholic journals about eating meat on Fridays. As a loyal Catholic I would not dream of breaking this commandment of the Church. But I must say I find this overdue emphasis, this irrelevant harping on something relatively unimportant to be somewhat childish. In a secular world bursting with sin and misery, in a burning Rome, are we sensible to fiddle with our consciences as to whether we should eat boiled beef or scampi on a Friday? I don't eat meat on a Friday,

but am not much interested in this problem, for behind my back I know that there are thirty thousand fatherless families in this country at this moment living on subsistence incomes, and this to me is of passionate concern. We must get our priorities right.

Parochial Troubles

Then again there seems to be no channel of communication between the layman and those in higher authority. If anything is wrong there seems to be no way of putting it right. As a writer one is the recipient of all sorts of confidences — mostly unasked for. And although I have no wish to start a diatribe against the parochial clergy one must face facts, for "facts are better than dreams" as Churchill aptly remarked. The priests I know and work with I like and respect. They are mostly dedicated and harassed men. But there are others. Said one to a parishioner: "You are the only one in this parish who is not frightened of me". That remark must be allowed to speak for itself, and it speaks volumes. Another three—perhaps the only three in the world—will not advance a penny towards Catechism classes to buy textbooks, or even the most elementary apparatus. And the classes can be held in any hole or corner. The lay catechists can spend their money, and do, even those who are students and are really short of cash. In another instance a curate wanted to form a ginger group. It was not allowed to meet in the presbytery. And the curate was forbidden to attend the meetings held in private houses. The ginger group lasted a winter session and ran out of ginger.

Lesson

No doubt others could add to the list. Who wants to? The sad and depressing thing is that there really seems to be no effective method of tackling such problems. The laity, God knows, have their faults, and hear about them from time to time, but on the whole they are a docile and loyal bunch. Wild horses wouldn't succeed in dragging them before their bishops with complaints against their priests. And so things go on; they may get better or they may get

worse. But the channels of communication are non-existent. And while a one-way-traffic system may be excellent for motor cars a one-way-traffic of ideas only produces passive resistance, lack of co-operation and, worst of all, an icy indifference which unnerves all those who are entirely committed to the advance of Christ's kingdom in this benighted century of ours.

Parish Forum

In another age the layman's role was "to hunt, to shoot, to entertain" and not to bother his head about ecclesiastical matters. It would not be worded quite like that now, but the sentiment lingers on in many quarters. Some kind of parish forum is called for as a beginning: a place where lively, fruitful, legitimate, respectful but uninhibited debate led to results. The bishop could attend the best of these discussions at his annual visitation and so keep his finger on the pulse of the community for which before God he is responsible. The voiceless layman, dumb or inarticulate, may have been suitable to a period when only the monk could read and write. To-day what with books and the national press the layman has come of age. Why not regularise and contain a fluid situation rather than let it drift and deteriorate?

A World To Explore

".... I have entered a new world which is unknown to the Church, a real mission field, a world I need time to explore—months, years. Why do Christian laymen never tell us how foreign the world is with which we live side-by-side?"

From *Priest and Worker*, the autobiography of Henri Perrin. When he wrote this, Henri Perrin was working from 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. in a factory in Paris which made insulating materials and plastics (plates, bowls, radio sets, and so on).

MONTHLY REPORT

The easing of restrictions against Protestants, the creeping abolition of censorship, the discovery that opposition does not mean subversion, the evolution of Spanish relations with Europe, all these and more are the straws in the wind of change that is blowing through Spain.

Spain To-day

HUGH KAY

It was a strange experience to stand in the streets of Madrid in January and watch mixed groups of Catholics and Protestants crowding into each other's churches to pray and read the bible together. It was the week of prayer for Church unity, now celebrated for the first time in Spain in the ecumenical spirit of Vatican II. Five years ago, when it was common to speak of the persecuted Spanish Protestant, this prospect would have seemed highly improbable. Now there is little doubt that before the end of the year the bill of emancipation for Spain's Protestant communities will have passed the Cortes. This will mark the end of an eight-year struggle by the Foreign Minister, Sr. Fernando Mario Castiella, to release the country's 30,000 non-Catholics from a multiplicity of crippling restrictions: on the building of further churches, on the opening of schools, on the importation of bibles, on access to public office and freedom to marry. And the bill is designed to restore legal status to Protestant bodies, with the right to possess legal title to land and property. The story is indicative of the evolutionary process through which the Spain of to-day is working out new formulas for her political and social identity amidst a welter of stresses and counter-stresses.

Castiella and Pius XII

It began when Castiella, formerly Spain's envoy to the

Vatican and a personal friend of Pius XII, assumed the conduct of foreign policy and faced the pressures brought to bear by ambassadors from non-Catholic countries. The sceptic will label what follows as enlightened self-interest. The observer who knows Castiella the man will also see the impact of Pius XII's ecumenical thought on the mind of a liberal Catholic who knows some theology. Having decided that emancipation was the only realistic policy in a changing world and the fast developing ecumenical climate, Castiella began to put into practice slowly the principles he hoped to enshrine at a later date in the law. The obstacles were daunting. The traditional Protestant Churches, like the Spanish Reformed Church which enjoyed communion with the Church of Ireland, had always behaved with dignity. Certain extremist sects, however, notably those with American backing, had chosen to wage their proselytising campaigns with inflammatory methods. It does not take much to kindle a flame in Spanish life, and blasphemous tirades against Our Lady from militant pulpits had led to the burning of non-Catholic chapels. Compensation had been paid, and the Catholic culprits punished, but feeling still ran high. In any event, Spanish Catholicism was highly conservative. A powerful section continued to see the non-Catholic presence as the intrusion of the 16th century Reformation. Spain was almost entirely Catholic, it was argued, and the voice of heresy had no rights.

Hierarchy Divided

The Spanish hierarchy was divided. The liberal wing, associated with the aging Primate and the man who is now Cardinal Herrera, Bishop of Malaga, endorsed Castiella's new approaches. The traditionalist wing, on the other hand, presented a formidable intransigence. There was an incident in which a non-Catholic soldier, forced on church parade, refused to kneel at the Elevation. Thanks to the outmoded attitudes of his commanding officer, and a local judge, he was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment. The reaction of the local bishop was that the sentence was half what it should have been, and it took 18

months of hard backstage work to get the soldier released. Meanwhile, however, Castiella began to build up cordial personal relations with the responsible Spanish Churches. They brought their grievances to him privately, and he consistently worked to redress them as and when he could. New Protestant Churches were opened with permission, one by one. Protestant bibles were allowed in again. The reign of Pope John profoundly affected the views of the bishops and of the government, which also contains its reactionary and progressive elements. The "conversion" of the bishops was virtually assured by 1962, and every government minister bar one fell into line. General Franco, the head of state, never obstructed the Castiella policy, and in fact endorsed it; for this I have the minister's personal word. Those bishops who remained by instinct reluctant began to express the view that the decision should be left to the Holy See under the Concordat.

It was in these circumstances that the emancipation bill, drafted by Castiella, went to Rome for formal approval, and it was decided to see which way the Vatican Council moved on its own propositions for the principles of religious liberty. It soon became clear that a majority of the Fathers favoured the liberal draft presented by the Christian Unity Secretariat. Last year Cardinal Bea's visit to Spain underlined the soundness of the emancipation bill's intent. The Spanish Hierarchy formally endorsed it, after a rearguard action by the Bishop of the Canaries had been firmly quashed by the Papal Nuncio.

Nothing to Fear from Liberty

The decision at the end of Vatican II's third session to postpone the vote on religious liberty until the fourth session (due to open this September) came as a severe setback. It is believed that Mgr. Murcillo, the progressive Archbishop of Madrid, was among a group of Spanish bishops who threw their weight behind the demand for the vote to be taken in the third session, while a few of the more conservative ones joined the minority of the Council Fathers who demanded more time to study the amendments. Meanwhile, two or three government

ministers in Madrid, who had been "got at" by traditionalists among the laity, began to ask how Catholic bishops could endorse the proposed emancipation bill in conscience. Reactionary local officials, clinging to the letter of the law, continued to be responsible for irritating incidents calculated to war against the new *apertura*. Then, in his New Year message, General Franco came out publicly on the side of religious liberty, declaring, in words adopted from a comment by Pope Paul to a Spanish prelate, that Spain had nothing to fear from it. The effect of this was virtually decisive. When I saw Castiella in January, he assured me of his conviction that the bill will be law this year—as it is now practically certain that the Vatican Council will promulgate its own decree in September.

New Attitudes

That rather lengthy story was worth the telling because it sums up so much in Spanish life to-day. There is a powerful liberalising drive at work within the monolithic structure of the state. Where attempts to change the law at once would certainly fail, it strives to achieve in practice what it can then present to the head of state and the Cortes as a virtual *fait accompli* which can safely be translated into juridical form. A typical example is the slow birth of a press law abolishing censorship, now creaking its way along under the impatient hand of the Minister of Information, Sr. Manuel Fraga Iribarne. Progress has been most marked in the development of the Labour Syndicates. These processes are slow and seem to yield too little in terms of formal definition. Sometimes there seem to be outright setbacks. When the new law of association was recently passed, the five prelates who sit in the Cortes were notably absent for the passage of a bill which, while it was in essence mildly progressive, seemed to set a new seal on the illegality of political parties other than the National Movement, and of free association generally. The attitudes of local officials, as in the case of the Protestants, result in absurdities like the recent prosecution of an editor for suggesting that conscription be reduced. Yet the fact remains that profound psychological changes have been

taking place, and the results are apparent in new attitudes rather than in specific events.

Tension of Adult Dialogue

The Spaniard, like his landscape, is said to know the sun and the night but never the grey or the twilight. Yet to-day the whole Spanish scene is becoming mottled. Opposition is no longer regarded as synonymous with subversion. There is a dialectic between the old and new guard in the government. The voice of protest is less afraid, more articulate and constructive. Tension is high, yet much of it is the tension of adult dialogue. With one bad exception, the street demonstrations which took place earlier this year, when workers and students pleaded for freer syndical organisations, were accepted without drama or ugly incidents. Of course, said uneasy officials, subversive elements were at work. Yet they also conceded the note of reason in the demands and glimpsed in their expression a new maturity. Church papers are not censored, and some of them are extremely critical. Organisation of opposition groups is still outlawed, yet nobody is afraid to make individual protests any more. The old days of looking over your shoulders in a cafe to spot the policeman are fading right out. Sentences for conducting "illegal propaganda" are becoming nominal and there are many outright acquittals. There is a deep discontent over the absence of free political structures, yet it is doubtful, in Spain to-day, whether more than two or three per cent would think in terms of violent solutions—if that. Perhaps 8 to 10 per cent would favour more or less Marxist solutions. The rest range from Christian and Social Democrats (who believe in parliamentary forms) to men of the centre distrustful of party politics in the light of past history. The latter believe in the development of democratic infrastructures within the monolith.

"Loyal Opposition"

Remembering the days of multiple political parties, with their trade union arms, fragmenting the nation and battling it out in the streets of Madrid long before the Civil War,

they prefer to work in terms of social, as opposed to political, pressure groups—such as the Church, the legal faculties, the family movements, the Catholic Workers' Brotherhood. Such a man is Professor Ruiz-Gimenez, who recently resisted the government's new law of association, and yet, contrary to reports, remains a member of the Cortes. He allows that democratic infra-structures have arisen—there are thousands of elected posts within the labour syndicates—and believes they can still evolve to more liberal forms under pressure from *within*. But he rebukes the slowness of the tempo, and indeed senior officials of the syndicates will tell you openly of their conviction that the top posts in their organisation will have to be freed from the system of appointment and subjected to elections like the bulk of the syndicate posts. As a matter of fact, the syndicates already present a feature hitherto unknown in Spanish history, namely that of a "loyal opposition". Officials who come to the senior posts with fairly right-wing attitudes are rapidly affected by contact with the leftwards tendencies of the elected spokesmen they have to work with, and the syndicates' influence in the Cortes and in the government goes further than their legal status would suggest. Labour M.P.'s and trade unionists from Britain have testified repeatedly to the vigour of debate in the Spanish syndical congresses which they have attended. For all the objections raised against them, the syndicates are providing Spain with a *de facto* training in local democracy, especially as they send elected representatives to all the municipal government structures and to the governing body of the vast network of social services operated by the *Mutualidades*.

Too Busy for Subversion

Groups ranging from the Catholic Workers' Brotherhood to Christian and Social Democrats, not to mention Socialists and Communists, vigorously demand separate trade unions for the workers with a legal right to strike, as opposed to the existing syndicates which combine employer and employee in the one organisation. The recent street demonstrations gave strong expression to this. But

it is noteworthy that many of these critics, who receive strong support from certain bishops and clergy, are themselves syndical officials and thus in a position to carry their reasonable opposition into the monolith itself. But the struggle to enter the new Europe, to bring Spain's economic miracle to the hearth of every working family, and the emergence of a stabilising middle class for the first time combine to make most Spaniards far too busy today to care for subversive politics. Many industrial workers, whose improved wages are being offset by rising prices, are doing two jobs — sometimes for the large family's survival, sometimes to run the small car whose name in Spain is now Legion. Thousands of boys are learning their crafts in Labour Universities, a cross between the English public school and a Ford motor works. Vocational training centres are working to give skills to thousands of unskilled men and women. The irrigation projects of the agricultural areas, yielding co-operative farming, scores of new townlets and the great hydro-electric schemes of the Plan Badajoz, are making inroads on the vast problem of depressed living among peasants and rural labourers. The process is gradual but massive, and is now irreversible.

Franco not Inflexible

In this vital, self-questioning phase of Spain's development there is a note of high excitement in the air. The fact is that a nation, after 150 years of fragmentation, was bound together again after the Civil War by a strong, authoritarian regime. But, as the years have gone by, prisoners charged with threatening the security of the state have dwindled from 20,000 to about 500, and the gradual liberalisation of the economic structures has been inevitably followed by similar trends in social and political life. Franco is undoubtedly authoritarian, but not, as he would see it, totalitarian. Some foreign diplomats in Madrid believe that to-day he enjoys less initiative than De Gaulle does in France. Some critics say that pressure of events has forced him to loosen his grip. Both overlook the simple basic truth that, whatever else he is, Franco is the very obverse of inflexible. They overlook his canny, Gallego

sense of balance, his Celtic genius for strategy and manoeuvre, his sceptical yet realistic capacity for adaptation and for playing off against each other the many pressure groups which hamper his action very much more than the outside world has realised. The real story of this extraordinary man has yet to be told in a Spain that is no longer the country of mañana. Cardinal Herrera has often criticised the regime. But he points out that it has given his country a peace and stability that was once despained of.

Spain's Economic Miracle

The spread of an emergent prosperity among the industrial workers has brought to Spain all sorts of new attitudes, and the rise of foreign investment has injected a new international sense. By 1959, Spain's political isolation was virtually ended, thanks in the first instance to the United States. The government then decided to abandon the restrictions of economic autocracy, and, with the help of the International Monetary Fund and other bodies, worked out a plan for economic stabilisation. The balance between home and foreign markets was redressed. Equilibrium was restored in the public sector of industry and bank credits opened in the private sector. The liberal young ministers in the economic departments abandoned multiple rates of exchange, fixed a reasonable parity for the *peseta*, and opened a system of free trade. Inflation was checked, marginal industries of a non-competitive inefficiency were liquidated. The results were striking. Gold reserves had been minimal. Now they stand at more than 100 million dollars and Spain has become an important buyer of gold on the international exchange. Stabilisation was achieved by 1961. Then the era of expansion began, and the World Bank Report of 1962 hailed the dawn of Spain's "economic miracle". In 10 years, electricity production has trebled. In 11 years, crude oil imports rose from 400,000 tons to eight million. In 12 years, iron production quadrupled. Steel rose from 800,000 tons a year to 2,200,000. The output of motor cars in 1962 was six times as great as in 1955. The current Development Plan, extending from 1964 to

1967, is going flat out for a cumulative increase of 6 per cent per annum in the gross national product. The stress is shifting from the agricultural to the industrial and services sectors. The Plan envisages the creation of 1,000,000 new jobs, and wholesale modernisation is going on in coal mining, the iron and steel, building, and textile industries.

For many years a national scheme of social security has been developing, and both the syndicates and the Church make extensive contributions to housebuilding for lower paid workers, as well as to free education and vocational training for adults. The Labour Universities and the Centres of Accelerated Formation, run by the Syndicates, put Spanish education in the forefront of the imaginative experiments which characterise the whole of Western Europe to-day.

Spain and Europe

The great aim now is to bring Spain right into Europe in the fullest sense of the term, and once again it has submitted an application for some form of association with the Common Market. The opposition of some of the European Socialist Parties—notably the Italian and those of the Benelux countries—still stands in the way. But nearly 60 per cent of Spain's external trade is carried on with Western Europe, and sooner or later the logic of the situation will have to be faced. By its cultural and ethnic traditions, and by virtue of the aid it is now giving to under-developed countries, Spain is a natural meeting point for Europe, Africa and Latin America. Her excellent relations with the Arab countries are of special significance in this. It may be that complete integration into the European comity of nations must await the rise of a government dissociated from a controversial past. The sanest opposition minds in the university still believe that this must come about by evolution rather than by even a bloodless revolution. One thing is sure. The vast majority of Spaniards are determined never to return to the days of fratricidal conflict. They have much to give to the world, and the evolution should be encouraged; if we want to see new political forms in Spain, the way to hasten the day is

to develop further the dialogues now established between the trade union movements of our two countries, not by incessant attacks and an outmoded prejudice which seeks to fight the Civil War all over again.

The Rock and a Face-Saving Formula

The current argument about Gibraltar is a wretched obstacle to dialogue. Spain claims that Gibraltar is not a British colony in the sense that it can be given independence. The Treaty of Utrecht gave it to Britain with the proviso that, should Britain want to relinquish her title to it, the reversion should go to Spain, not to the local residents or anyone else. The United Nations has shown itself, at least tacitly, sympathetic to this view. The Committee of 24 did not recommend "de-colonisation". The Spaniards claim that the Rock is as Spanish as the Lizard is British, yet they do not want to see Britain turned out. What they really resent, and the real reason for the customs restrictions at La Linea, is the posturing of Gibraltarians — a mixture of Genoese, Portuguese, Maltese and British—who in one breath profess their pride in being Gibraltarian and in the next declare themselves to be British for ever—mainly because they want to hang on to the higher standards of living Britain provides them with. Perhaps the Spaniards are being irrationally truculent. Perhaps Britain made matters worse by the frigates affair and the preposterous cancellation of the naval exercises (which infuriated our own Defence Ministry as much as it did the Spaniards). The fact remains that the United Nations has called for negotiation. Britain refuses to do this under pressure from the customs restrictions, and refuses in any event to have any discussion on the issue of sovereignty. The answer is simple enough. Spain should stop this petulant nonsense at the border. Britain should drop her attempt to restrict the scope of discussion. And, whatever the face-saving formula that may have to be found, there is no reason why the living standards of the Gibraltarians should not be protected. and the British base maintained. Spain should also be brought into NATO.

In this article Dr. Jackson considers the half a million earning under £11 a week, those cruelly affected by the "wage stop", and the unhappy men who earn less in wages than others draw on National Assistance. He finally argues the need for a substantial increase in Family Allowances.

The Working Poor

J. M. JACKSON

To-day, most people think of poverty as being a problem of old age. If they stop to consider the matter further, they realise that some younger people may also be forced to live in poverty, but only because some misfortune has befallen them—the young widow with a family of dependent children, or the younger person who becomes a chronic invalid. Now that the average earnings of a manual worker in industry are over £18 a week, they tend to assume that nobody who is in a job should have any difficulty in managing to live comfortably on his wage. I have referred before to the arguments of those who would do away with Family Allowances as being unnecessary. This is to overlook the fact that although the *average* earnings of men in industry are now £18 a week, not everybody gets anything like that figure. An average implies that some earnings are higher than £18 a week, and equally that some are less than £18. Some indeed are very much less. In 1960, the Ministry of Labour undertook a detailed survey of the distribution of earnings. At that time, average earnings were in the region of £14-10s. a week, but there were about 1 per cent of all workers earning less than £8 a week and 3 per cent earning less than £9. Three workers out of every hundred were earning less than two-thirds of the average earnings in the country as a whole. Only three in every hundred? A fairly small percentage, but for all that it represents something like half a million men.

When we think in terms of half a million men earning

well below two-thirds of the average earnings in industry, the problem begins to assume a bigger magnitude. In fact, the problem is probably a bigger one than this figure suggests. The survey that was carried out in October 1960 relates to manual workers in *manufacturing industry*. This survey did not include agricultural workers, whose wages are very much lower (even allowing for "perks"). Neither did it include white collar workers, whose earnings in the lower grades are not particularly high. If, therefore, we take the figure of half a million earning well below two-thirds of the much publicised average of £18 a week, we need not fear that we are exaggerating the problem.

Is it, however, all that serious that half a million men are earning less than, say, £11 or £12 a week? This wage will sound magnificent to many old people who retired before 1939. Then £3 a week was a good wage for a manual worker, but it would have bought as much as three or four times that sum to-day. Even so, it is putting the worst paid 3 per cent of the labour force on a par with a relatively well paid man before the war.

Irrelevance of the Bombay Beggar

The truth is we cannot judge poverty in absolute terms. We live in an affluent society, and the man who falls far below the standard of living of his fellows is bound to feel poor. It is no great consolation to him to be told that before the war, comparatively few people could afford to buy what he can afford: still less will he consider himself relatively well off because his standard of living is far and away above that of a beggar in a Bombay slum. He judges his state by reference to that of other people in the society in which he is living — particularly those in more or less his own social class. He may not worry unduly about the managing director's Rolls Royce and his cigars: what does worry him is that he cannot, like so many ordinary workers, get a small second-hand car, or a washing machine for his wife; or that he must think twice before joining his mates at the local for a pint.

Even so, most of these men will be earning between £10 and £11, and there is no doubt that, for many of the men

getting such a wage, this is not really inadequate. Even if they are fairly acutely aware that their pay packets are smaller than those of a great many of their fellow workers, £10 or £11 compares very favourably with the £4 of a single pensioner, or the £6-10 of a married couple in retirement. Even if they apply for National Assistance, a married couple in retirement are not likely to get much over £8 a week, and most will get considerably less than this (depending upon how much rent they are paying). It is only in the case of the family with dependent children that these low wages really begin to appear inadequate.

Family Size and Earnings

It is very difficult to say how many cases of hardship occur in the country because a man with dependent children is earning very low wages. We know, very roughly, how many industrial workers fall into each wage range. (Only very roughly because the regular Ministry of Labour surveys only tell us average earnings and nothing about the distribution of those earnings. The detailed survey made in 1960 is one of a type that is only made at very long and irregular intervals.) We know next to nothing about the relationship between family size and earnings. Who, in fact, are these men with very low earnings? Some are undoubtedly older men whose earning capacity has fallen with age; men who can no longer undertake the kind of work they did when younger, and have had to accept jobs in a lower grade. But among these men with very low earnings are also a good many younger men, and some of these will have families — perhaps large families. There is some evidence to suggest that among the very poorly paid, the large family is commoner than among the better paid. Or, put the other way, average earnings tend to fall with increasing family size. (According to the reports of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, average income increases slightly with the number of children, but this is hardly surprising in view of the payment of Family Allowances. It is, however, noticeable that the average income of a four-child family is less than 10s. above that

of a three-child family, i.e. the difference is less than the additional Family Allowance for the fourth child.)

It is fairly common knowledge that some men prefer to remain on National Assistance in preference to working. It is not merely that there are some men who are work-shy. Certainly there is no point in denying that some men do not like hard work. Others, however, find that they may be able to get more money from the National Assistance Board than they could hope to get if they went to work.

The "Wage Stop"

The surprising thing is not that so many men prefer to remain on National Assistance rather than to work, in order to give their families a few more of the *necessities* of a decent life: rather the surprising thing is that so many men when faced with this agonising dilemma prefer to work. In the National Assistance scheme there is a "wage stop" which seeks to prevent this kind of thing happening. The idea is that when on National Assistance a man should be no better off than when he is in employment. At present, National Assistance might allow a married couple roughly £6 a week, and 25s. a week for each child (this varies with age) plus whatever they are paying in rent (within certain limits). Thus a man with four children paying 30s. rent would be entitled to about £12-10s. The National Assistance Board would see what a man was receiving (for example, National Insurance unemployment benefit and family allowances) and make up the difference between this and £12-10s. Suppose, however, he normally earned only £10 a week. When in work, therefore, he would have an income of £10 plus Family Allowances of 28s. but he would have nearly 12s. deducted for his National Insurance stamp (more, by the time this appears in print). If we add 28s. (Family Allowances) to his pay packet *after deduction* of his stamp we get a figure of £10-16s. The wage stop means that the National Assistance Board will not bring this man's income above £10-16s. when he is out of work. Indeed, the limit may be set lower, because they may take account of other savings he may make when out of work, such as his fares to work, etc.

Fundamental Issue

If a man's last job was badly paid, he will be subject to the wage stop if he applies for National Assistance. It is the man who had a reasonably well paid job, but has no prospect of getting something as good again who may find it profitable to remain on National Assistance.

We are here faced with a serious and fundamental issue. National Assistance is intended to ensure that whatever his sources of income, or lack of them, he will be able to provide himself with the basic necessities of a decent life. The scales of benefit laid down for National Assistance are intended to represent the minimum that is needed in contemporary society to purchase the basic necessities of life. While we can appreciate the need not to encourage idlers, the existence and working of the wage stop draws attention to the unhappy fact that some men are paid such a low wage that even with the help of Family Allowances their standard of living is below that of most people on National Assistance. In other words, hardworking men are getting less than society has deemed to be the barest minimum that ought to be available to all. And if they are out of work, the wage stop ensures that they still remain below our society's concept of a reasonable level of subsistence. Nor is this all. It would be bad enough that some men's wages are such that, if they have a family, they fall below the National Assistance scales. Worse, I am convinced that the National Assistance scales themselves become increasingly inadequate as family size increases.

Household Expenditure Survey

Before the recent increase in both National Insurance and National Assistance benefits, the National Assistance scale allowed 63s. 6d. for a single person plus rent. Some little time ago, I tried to estimate what it would cost a larger household to maintain the same kind of standard of living as that enjoyed by the single person living on National Assistance. The Ministry of labour publishes each year a *Household Expenditure Survey*. One of the tables shows the way in which pensioner households with an income of under £4 a week (almost exclusively single per-

son households) spent their incomes. Their average expenditure on things others than rent amounted to about four or five shillings more than the National Assistance scale then laid down. (In fact, the National Assistance Board disregards some small items of income, and so many a person actually on National Assistance could have been receiving this higher income of the "average single pensioner" of the Ministry's survey.

I then looked at each item in the single pensioner's expenditure and tried to see how much more would be needed by a married couple, and by each child. In most cases, I was deliberately conservative in making these estimates. Most of the single pensioners in the Ministry sample were women, and spent only a shilling or two on beer and cigarettes. I made no allowance for the fact that a working couple would expect to spend much more than that on such items, in a typical case. I assumed, too, that transport costs were doubled for a married couple and for each child increased by half of what the single pensioner spent. The pensioner does not need to go out very much, but the working man must travel regularly to his place of work. In many places, if children have to take a bus to school they may spend fully as much as a pensioner on fares. Clothing expenses I assumed to increase proportionately to the number of people in the household. This makes no allowance for the rate at which children often grow out of clothes, nor for the fact that both children and manual workers will subject their clothing to very much greater wear and tear than the pensioner. Again, I assumed expenditure on fuel remained constant. Many people will no doubt argue that old people feel the cold more, but a family of children and a man engaged on a dirty job will mean considerable expenditure on hot water for washing clothes. On the whole, then, the estimates I attempted to make were of such a kind that in so far as there was an error, it was in the direction of deliberately underestimating, and perhaps seriously underestimating the income required by a family with children. What then were the results?

Ungenerous Treatment of Families

First, the National Assistance scale allowed a single person a few shillings a week less than the actual expenditure of the typical single pensioner. For a married couple, the scale allowed involved a slight fall in the standard of living compared with that of the single person on National Assistance. For a family with children on National Assistance, there is a further fall, the standard of living possible declining steadily with each child. At this time, National Assistance allowed 23s. for a child between 5 and 11. My estimate of the average additional income required per child was more in the region of 36s. a week. In the case of the working man, the additional Family Allowance paid in respect of the third and subsequent children is 10s., which represents about a third of the minimum cost of keeping a child. It has never been intended that these allowances should meet the whole cost of maintaining a child in the normal course of events. This, however, is not to say that they should not represent a substantially higher proportion of the cost than they in fact do when we are dealing with families at the very lowest end of the income scale.

At the beginning of this article, I pointed out that there are men in jobs to-day who are being paid a wage below what a family of moderate size (say three or four children) would get on National Assistance. That would be bad enough, but we now see that it is by no means the full picture. In fact, the National Assistance scales deal ungenerously with families with children. We saw earlier on that a man with a wife and four children paying 30s. a week rent might have his income made up to a total of £12-10s. a week if he is on National Assistance. Given that in future he will have to pay nearly 15s. a week in National Insurance contributions, and that he has some other increased expenses when working, he really needs about £12 a week in wages to be as well off as on National Assistance. (This will leave him £11-5s. after insurance is deducted, to which 28s. family allowances must be added, making a total of £12-13s.)

Increase Family Allowance

But since the National Assistance scales for children are, on average, *at least* 10s. or 11s. less than the minimum cost of keeping a child, he will need to be earning at least £14 a week if he is to keep his family at the same standard of living as is possible for the single person drawing National Assistance. We are far from generous in our social policy towards families with children, either when things go wrong and they have to apply for National Assistance, or when the father is in normal employment.

There is, therefore, a very strong case for increasing Family Allowances substantially. A great deal of concern has been shown for pensioners, but there is equally cause for concern over families with young children. Pensioners are only barred by their pride from claiming National Assistance if they are in real need. Families that have to rely on National Assistance will not find that their needs are anything like as fully taken care of. Moreover, there is the family of the man on very low wages for whom no assistance at all is provided. If family allowances were increased, the problem of the wage stop would largely disappear. We have seen that a man earning £10 or £11 a week is, if he has a family of four children, worse off than if he were on National Assistance and receiving the full benefit. We know that if, in fact, he goes on National Assistance, the wage stop will be applied and he will draw £1 or £2 less than the full rate of benefit. Suppose, however, that Family Allowances were raised to 20s. for the second and subsequent children. He would then have, when working for a wage of £10, a total income after deductions and including Family Allowances of £12·5s. His National Assistance benefit might still be reduced by 5s. below the normal scale, but this is very different from a reduction of something like £2. I am not saying that 20s. is the right figure for Family Allowances for the second and subsequent children. This figure would do much to prevent the wage stop being applied to men on National Assistance who have families of three or four children, and normally earned £10 or £11 a week. Equally, it would bring them, when work-

ing, into line with the standard of living possible on the ordinary National Assistance scale of benefit. It would still do nothing to bring families on National Assistance or the families of men earning very low wages into line with the living standards of single persons on National Assistance.

Moral Obligation

A good many problems are raised by the line of thought developed here. To what extent should people without families, or with smaller families, help larger families through Family Allowances? There is, in fact, a clear moral obligation to do so, because the childless expect in old age to be supported by the labours of these children of other people, whom they are reluctant to help support on an adequate scale during their own working life. They may save for their own future, but savings and the factories and machines they help to finance are worthless without the necessary labour force. The other danger some people fear is that such a generous system of Family Allowances would encourage a too rapid growth of population. Even if there is some danger, there will always be childless couples and one or two child families; and if nobody had more than three children, the working population would almost certainly fall from generation to generation. If some larger families are clearly essential, there can be no denying society's obligation towards all such families.

Something Woefully Wrong

"There is something woefully wrong with the health of a social system when a peasant tills the soil with the idea in his mind that, if he is a peasant, it is because he was not intelligent enough to become a school teacher". From *The Need For Roots* (p. 44), Simone Weil.

Are Catholics out of the Church when they seemingly deny Catholic doctrines? Does the theory of the just war make any sense? Should we experiment on animals? Why do we make so much fuss over the creation of cardinals? In mixed marriages wouldn't it help if half the children were brought up as Catholics and half as Protestants?

Any Questions?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

**Some Catholics seem to be denying Catholic doctrines.
Are they out of the Church?**

FREEDOM of public comment and debate always produces exaggerations and errors: and they have turned up in the discussion of doctrine started by the Second Vatican Council. Some writers, in their eagerness to find common ground with non-catholic Christians, have diluted the clear doctrine of the Church, or played it down, or failed to declare it. Others, in their deep feeling for the famine-stricken and the diseased, have questioned the soundness of doctrine in the Church which stands in the way of bringing immediate relief for those desperately in need.

Supposing a Catholic flatly denies a doctrine which Catholics are bound in conscience to hold, is he out of the Church?

The very fact of his refusal does not excommunicate him: and it is only a rare recalcitrant who, because of special circumstances, is formally expelled. The disbelievers that I know stay in the Church and "practise their religion", justifying themselves with a variety of reasons. Some have an incorrect notion of faith. They regard it as the acceptance as true of a "confession of faith", a creed: and they think that if they admit ninety per cent of the articles of the creed they are doing well. But faith is the acceptance of a person, Christ, and then of the Church

teaching with his authority, as an infallible truth-teller: and the rejection of one truth imposed on conscience by Christ, or by the Church speaking in his name, is the abandonment of Christ and the Church. Others, in difficulties about a doctrine, and knowing that belief is all or nothing, make out that the teaching they cannot accept is not the teaching of the Church but a private opinion. They then stay, logically, within the Church: they excommunicate not themselves but the doctrine, and their conscience can be temporarily at rest.

Does the theory of the just war make any sense at all?

WHAT good came out of the two world wars of this century? The first cost millions of lives, bred revolutions, and originated the second. That, in turn, gave impetus to forces headed towards collision. Violence, they say, breeds violence. The use of force anywhere—in education, internal government and international relations—settles nothing except the question which force at the moment is the stronger: and it provokes the vanquished to rival the victor in brute strength. It is likely that, if the police in this country carried arms, encounters with criminals would frequently turn into shooting matches, and order would be rather imperilled than safeguarded. A reliable estimate puts the death-roll for the 278 wars since 1515 at seven hundred millions.

Who would deny that warfare is appalling? Would anyone in his senses advocate war as a means of settling differences? Unfortunately, the answer to the second question calls for the composition of a longish list. It is part of orthodox communist theory that the dictatorship of the proletariat can be achieved only by violence. That basic belief persists though it may be hidden under the cloak of "peaceful co-existence". Before Communism there were rulers—backed by peoples—who waged war for power and glory: and the breed is not extinct.

So now, what? The theory of the just war is about self-defence against injustice. The alternative to self-defence is submission. For the determined adult it need not mean the abandonment of his religious and ethical principles:

but it would mean that for his children and for the whole of the next generation. Is there a right to use violence against violence to save the young and the unborn from corruption. Is such a defence an obligation? Defensive war costs lives. What does enslavement cost?

What is the morality of experimentation with animal subjects?

YOUR question is imprecise. Anyone who keeps animals carries out experiments, even if they are no more than observation to decide which tinned food pussy prefers. Experiments in cross-breeding are a fruitful part of farming. Valuable investigations have been made of animal instinct and intelligence. Then there is the use of animals to discover the effect of medical and surgical treatment which may benefit human beings.

Those different ways of interfering in the lives of animals presupposes an essential difference between them and human beings. Any human being exists under God for his own sake: he is an end in himself. Animals are not for their own sake: their purpose is to serve man. It is right for man to make the most of them in agriculture. Mankind's need of food justifies, in general, the use of techniques of mass production—of eggs, broilers, veal and beef.

There is, however, a limiting principle that must be honoured in the treatment of animals. They have a nature—for man's use, certainly, but for use according to the nature. The nature must not be spoiled by man's use of it. The example of soil makes the principle clear. Man should take crops from the soil, but not in such a way that the soil becomes sand. So man can use animals for food, but not in such a way that the food loses its nutritive properties—ceases to be food. There is a grave danger that quality will be lost as quantity is produced: and animals will not fulfil their purpose of feeding man properly.

For man's sake, animals are expendable. A canary which dies to give miners warning of dangerous concentrations of gas has fulfilled its purpose. So with animals on which

drugs are tested. But in respect for his own nature and theirs, man must not inflict unnecessary pain on animals.

Why so much fuss over the creation of cardinals—and just when the Church is supposed to be returning to Gospel simplicity?

ARE you confusing the essentials of cardinalialt status with the trappings? Cardinals are the key clergy of the diocese of Rome, and it is they who elect the bishop of that diocese in a vacancy. Some of them have an official part, in Rome, in the government of the diocese, the Church, and the Vatican City, which is the Pope's independent State. Any Pope has the duty of ensuring that there is a body of electors, in case of need. The nomination of cardinals is therefore an event of importance.

You would not ask for simplicity, Gospel-style, in the government of the Church. The Apostles would be lost in modern Rome and in the modern Church which have nineteen centuries of development on top of their foundations.

The complaint, then, must be because the nineteen centuries are supposed to have buried apostolic humility under the worldliness of power and display. Instead of "the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit" that St. Peter praises there is the pomp of "princes of the Church".

It would be naive, wouldn't it, to think that clothes make the man? There have been good and bad wearers of the purple. Charles Borromeo in Milan managed to be a true shepherd in renaissance garb. But it has to be admitted that people do tend to live up (or down) to their clothes. A new hat does something for their ego: a perfect outfit can be a substitute for personality. The Church is considering the picture she presents in the world. There are critics, official and self-appointed, of uniforms—usually other people's—and other accessories of status. Some reduction has already been made in the extent of a cardinal's robes: but what matters is that we have left the era of renaissance princes and are in the age of pastors.

Would it not greatly help, where mixed marriage is contemplated, if the old practice were restored of

bringing up half the children as Catholics and half as Protestants?

T would probably help to increase the number of mixed marriages in the Catholic Church, either by removing the objections to mixed marriage of earnest Protestants who will not agree to have their children brought up in a religion other than their own, or by removing the reason for which weak Catholics marry outside the Church.

A Catholic is one who believes that he needs Christ's revelation, and that the Catholic Church is the divinely commissioned guardian of that revelation. His religion is not just his fancy but a necessity. In it he finds the fullest expression of Christian truth delivered to him under the guarantee of infallibility: in it all the means of grace, sacrifice and sacraments are available for him. He cannot be satisfied with less. How, in conscience, can he be satisfied with less for his children? How can he deprive any of them of what he reckons necessary for himself? He would not set out deliberately to provide for only half the number of his children, feeding, sheltering, and educating them, and giving the others much less than what he thought they needed to survive and to enjoy life. Why should what is wrong for time be right for eternity?

In mixed marriages the defect in the union of husband and wife is rightly regretted: and the confusion is deplored which enters the minds of children when they are faced with the indifference or hostility of a parent to what they are being brought up to regard as of first importance. The old practice—which was an abuse and never an official policy—would extend the disunion, dividing the family into two camps. At the best, such a family would spread the error that one religion is as good as another: at the worst, it would revive the wars of religion.

The Great Mistake

"The great mistake of the Marxists and of the whole nineteenth century was to think that by walking straight on one mounted upwards into the air". *Gravity and Grace*—Simone Weil.

Learning from the Communists^{**}

3: PERSONNEL AND LEADERSHIP

DOUGLAS HYDE

I have particular reason to remember an Easter Mass at which an old Indian priest was preaching to a congregation of very poor people, Indians and Chinese. He told them that the women on the first Easter Sunday went looking for the Risen Lord. They looked in the Tomb and they did not find Him there and they looked around the Garden for Him. Again, they could not find Him. But, he said, you do not have to look in the Tomb, you do not have to look around the garden to find the Risen Lord, He is in your hands. When you go out to work tomorrow, whether you are pulling a rikisha or whether you are digging a drain, whatever you may be doing, you are co-operating in God's work of creation, God is in your hands.

Sitting in front of me was an old Indian with gnarled bare legs, with varicose veins — those of you who work in the Orient know the type. As the Indian preacher said that God is in your hands, I saw this old man look at his toil worn hands with their broken nails almost in awe. And it is my guess that work will never be the same for that man again. God is in his hands.

Suddenly whatever degraded form of work that he was doing became meaningful. It was related to things in which he believed, so that God and religion would not belong

*This series of eight self-contained articles, which we publish under the general title of *Learning from the Communists* contains, exactly as they were spoken, six conferences given by Douglas Hyde in the United States to a specially convened gathering of missionaries in September, 1962. They have been published recently by the Mission Secretariat in Washington D.C. I am extremely grateful to the Executive Secretary, Father Frederick A. McGuire, C.M. and to Douglas Hyde for their kind permission to reproduce in *Christian Order*. It is hoped that a book based on these extremely important conferences will be published later on in Britain by Messrs. Sands. Editor.

just to the Mass on Sunday. It could be related to cleaning the drains the next day or wherever his work might take him.

Wonderful Opportunity

That, of course, is how we ought to see it. It is not necessarily how our people do see it. The Communists see it like that. *Work is the most wonderful opportunity to spread Communism.* His work gives the Communist his biggest opportunity of all. It is in the nature of capitalist society to bring ever increasingly large numbers of people into every large building to produce for profit for the capitalist class. The capitalist class digs its own grave; it brings a ready-made audience together every day among whom the Communists can work. If you call a public meeting and have 5,000 people, you think you have done very well. Society presents the Communist with, it may be, scores of thousands of people every day—at the expense of the enemy, ready there for him to treat as an audience, as a group among whom he can work for Communism.

The most important part of the Communist's day is really his time at work. He sees work as a wonderful opportunity to work for his cause. I do not think we have really got that conception over to our people. More often than not they feel that if they are going to do any job for the church at all, it begins when they leave the factory, or the office, or the hospital wherever they work. Communists believe that that is the biggest opportunity of all.

I think that is something that we can definitely learn from them.

They go further than this. They say not only can your work, your work place, your fellow workers, be used for your cause. This is a ready-made audience and opportunity presented to you and this is typical of the communist approach—you have to make yourself as effective as you can *in that place, with that group.* You leave nothing to chance; you think the thing out.

"How am I going to be most effective?" The Communists think correctly that you will be most effective if you

are respected. You will be respected if you are good at your job, not because you can talk, not because you are always talking about Communism and always trying to sell communist papers. You will have an authority on all sorts of subjects, almost any subject you care to talk about, if you are good at your job. This may not be logical, but we know it is true.

Best Man at his Job

Take the industrial worker: There is still sufficient pride of craft left for craftsmen to have a great respect for the good craftsman, and in business, the business world is the same. A man is dismissed contemptuously, if he is inefficient. If he is no good, they say he is a bum. They do not listen to him. If he is good at his job, they listen to him.

Therefore, if you are going to be effective in your place of work, you must be the best man at your job. A rule of the Communist Party is that each member should aim to be the best man at his job. It is a splendid rule and, as I say, gives him authority which he otherwise would not have. He is listened to in a different way.

The Communists, of course, test their methods by "Does it work?" In this case, it does work, it is effective, and they have proven it over and over again. They are trying to sell to their public something which is difficult to sell. They are trying to sell something which is naturally unacceptable. But they give some thought to this question. And this is one of the means by which they manage to get their unpopular ideas over, an *unpopular minority to an apathetic majority*.

The Communists are active among students. Many of you know that from the areas in which you work. They are more active among students in Asia, and in Latin America today than they have ever been. This is going to grow—this increasing emphasis on students — particularly in Latin America.

Of course, you will get your odd communist student who will get so carried away by his Communism that he fails all his exams. That is not viewed with approval by the

Party. He is put on the spot for it. He is told " You work very hard and we are very grateful to you for what you have done. But you would have done a better job for Communism, if you had passed your exams. You will be more effective later on. You are not going to be only a student. Student life is a preparation for what follows. We hope you will be a Communist always and so your first job as a student is to pass your exams. The better you do, the better it will be for your cause."

Study Made Meaningful

This makes study meaningful. It is given, as it were, a communist purpose, a communist meaning, and this means that the student can go to his studies with more enthusiasm. This is a preparation for being more effective for the thing in which he believes. Working hard for his exams is working hard for Communism.

The same is true of the people working in industry.

This is a particular approach to work — a particular approach to life and the world that I am trying to get over to you. This is the approach the Communists have. It is sound. It is good. We have no quarrel with this. The tragedy is that it is used for an evil purpose.

I believe it is right for us to try to convey this approach to our students, and to our own lives and our own work. It is those who are good at the job who make the greatest impact. Of course, it would be wrong for me to suggest that we do not have people with the same approach. We do, but I think you will agree that we do not have enough of them. This is not the norm, it is the exception. I can think of those exceptions.

Two Belgian Jesuits

I was in Calcutta at the beginning of 1962, staying with the Jesuits. There were two Belgian Jesuits. One was taking the trouble to become recognized as one of the foremost Bengalese scholars in East Bengal. The other is known as one of the outstanding Sanskrit authorities, again a Belgian, not an Indian. The one who has become the great Sanskrit man is also an authority on Indian music and he is invited

to Hindu marriages, weddings and funerals, to sing hymns in Sanskrit, hymns which he has written, to the Holy Ghost, to the Blessed Trinity, etc.

These men have made an impact because they have mastered the subject which is theirs. They have done it, knowing what they were doing, for a purpose. If they make converts, these are not going to be second-class people. Now we are not going to divide our converts into first and second-class converts in the sense of first and second-class souls. But it is true that they will attract people of their type—like does attract like—and they are going to make an impact where that impact can be tremendously important.

The Communist Party believes as I say, that work can be used for Communism, that it is the greatest opportunity of all. Of course, you are not at work all the time. You have another period of your day when you are free to work for Communism in a different way. So the Party again does not leave it to chance. It asks itself "What are the best forms of activity and how do we organise that activity?"

The Party and its Campaigns

The Communists have a slogan—the Party lives by its campaigns—which is true to a very great extent. The recruits to the Party, as I pointed out earlier, come in through the campaigns which the Party runs. The campaigns keep the Party members active the whole time. A lot of thought has to be given to starting one campaign after another which will keep their people in action. They want that action to be as purposeful and as meaningful as possible.

We know quite well that, in fact, people can see action as an end in itself.

I knew a man who devoted every moment of his spare time, seven days a week, 365 days a year to raising homing pigeons. You have known people like that. There are those who spend every minute playing bridge. Others who spend every minute organising other people.

Action can become an end in itself. In appealing to

people to be active, we are not going against the grain, as it were. They will get satisfaction from activity. If it is made meaningful, they will get even greater satisfaction. The Communists recognise this and they try to make it meaningful. They are determined to keep their people active all the time.

So they plan their campaigns. The basis is this: If they are going to be successful, they must be related to the real needs, the real desires of the people. This may sound odd to you on the part of Communists because you will feel that what the Communists do are against the needs of the people, against their best interests. Communist *propaganda* is usually in tune with the needs of the people. It may not be closely related, from the outsider's point of view, to the long-term aims of Communism, but always the Communist tries to keep his ear to the ground to see what the public is saying, what they are thinking, what the people really need and he tries to gear campaigns to these real needs.

Campaigns Tailored to Needs

Mao Tse-tung, in volume four of his *Selected Works*, has one essay on what he calls "*From the people to the people.*" The idea is that you send your Communists out among the people; you try to discover what they want most, what are the things which are occupying their minds, what are the things which are nearest to their hearts. You then report back to your Communist Party cell or group what you have discovered. The Party then tailors its campaign to the things the people already want.

You take it from the people, give it a communist content and give it back to the people. Since it originated with the people, they will naturally respond to it. Of course, Mao Tse-tung approached this thing in a unprincipled way. I do not say that we can use Mao Tse-tung's method but the idea behind it of trying to discover what are the needs of the people, and seeing what we have to say on them is worthy of consideration.

The Communists say that their aim is a communist world. That means *every country* of the world. That aim is

firmly in the communist mind, each individual's mind, the whole of the time. What he does is related to his attempt to attain a communist world. But it is also true that if you are campaigning, you cannot campaign for a communist world all the time. That is the long-term objective.

As you read communist books, books by Lenin or Stalin, for example, you see the terminology is the terminology of a military textbook. They think in terms of strategy and tactics, campaigning and so on. Now the whole art of campaigning is to be able to maintain the morale of your troops.

Maintaining Morale

Any military man, any top military man, has to think in terms of these things. They know perfectly well that if you take a big defeat, your men may become demoralised but there are ways of avoiding this. There is a little fact of human psychology that you can take a big defeat, if you throw your people quickly into action again in some sector of the front where they can get even a small victory. You can still maintain the morale of your troops.

Leave them inactive and before long they are demoralised. For this reason you need your long term objectives, but you need intermediate and short term objectives as well. The long term objective of a communist world may not be achieved for some time; although Communists believe it will be achieved in our lifetime. But Communists are given goals which are capable of realisation here and now.

I suppose if we think in terms of our long-term objectives, we will say that ours is *the world for Christ*, the extension of Christ's kingdom all over the world. It is a fair equation but it seems far ahead to our Christians, too understandably. It is something that should be there as a goal. But human beings want something they see immediately so there have to be intermediate objectives as well.

The Communist says that his intermediate one is to win his country for Communism — to devise ways and means of doing this. A Communist United States, a Communist Britain, a Communist Indonesia, Africa — wherever it is

you come from. That is the intermediate goal. So his activity will be geared to trying to find ways and means of making his country Communist.

Christian Objective

For the Christian, as I see it, the equivalent aim would be to *Christianise the society in which he lives*, all the institutions and organisations which go to make up the modern state. To Christianise the public opinion in which he has to operate, to try to change the climate of opinion, so that you have an atmosphere which is conducive to making new converts and to the spread of Catholic ideas.

At any rate the Communists keep their intermediate objective constantly in mind. But he does not see the Party's campaigns as ends in themselves, they are geared to these two objectives. There must also be the *immediate objectives*. This is like the little skirmish into which you send people, knowing in advance that they are likely to achieve a victory. It is terribly important psychologically to maintain their morale. It is important that they do not lose heart after a time.

The immediate objective may be anything. You run a campaign on some local issue, a campaign which is likely to bring results. If they can see results from time to time, then they get the human satisfaction of something attempted, something done. There is a great satisfaction that is to be got from that.

Another immediate objective, of course, which the Communist is encouraged to bear in mind all the time is the making of converts.

One would suppose that since the Church was a missionary church from the very first day that this thought of making converts should be in the mind of all our people. It is not. It does not even occur to many of them — just literally that.

Conversion-minded

The Communists never forget it. I am not saying that we have to send all our people out to proselytise, forcing their beliefs down people's throats, but it is a question of trying

to create situations where it is possible to make converts, or at any rate, to gain the attitude of mind, where people think in terms of making converts. The Communists are conversions-minded. Any Communist worth his salt, moving into a new group of people, will instinctively look around to see who are the probables, the ones who may be made into converts most easily. He will work upon them and he will try to devise ways and means of making converts. Later on when we are discussing techniques, I will discuss with you the question of convert-making.

What I am discussing with you now, really, is an attitude of mind. You will see that this is what it is all about, *an attitude of mind*.

An attitude of mind on the part of yourselves — an attitude of mind which you should convey to others — which too often is absent in our circles.

You can learn leadership techniques—I am trying to put some over to you. You can learn leadership techniques — you may learn them from lectures — you may learn them from a textbook but you will never become a leader unless you get a certain attitude of mind for it. That attitude of mind may be summed up like this: You have created a leader when you have created an attitude of mind, where a person thinks in terms of leadership. It is as simple as that in a way.

Hunger for Leadership

In other words, when some new situation arises, the average person says: "Why doesn't someone do something? Who is going to give us a lead?" The person who has been made to think as a leader instinctively, without stopping to ask himself the question, says: "What do I do in this situation? What we ought to do is so-and-so." He proposes a course of action, and since he has established himself with his group in a way that they have confidence in him, they listen to what he says and when he says, "I think we ought to do so-and-so," they respond to this suggestion. It is, as I say, an attitude of mind.

The fact is that people are hungry for leadership to-day. Do not think it is a big up-hill struggle trying to get people

to respond to a lead. For, if a lead is given effectively, people will follow. If you doubt that, see the sort of people who are leading today. See how the Jehovah Witnesses, Moral Rearmament, anyone can get a following today. If you have dedicated people, as you have in the movements I have named, who have given some thought to this question, they get a following all right.

Almost any sort of quack can get a following today, if he comes before the people to offer them a lead. Men have never been as leaderless as they are today. Never were there so many bewildered, leaderless men in the world as we have now. We can sit down and weep about it or we can rejoice and say: "Here is a heaven-sent opportunity." The Communists see it as an opportunity. I think that we should see it in the same way.

Really one learns to lead by getting that attitude of mind — one says instinctively "What do I do in this situation?" and suggests a course of action. You learn to lead by leading. You gain confidence as you go along.

No Faith in our People

The Communists send their people into action. Again I want to talk very frankly to you, without even trying to be polite. They send their people into action and they believe in them. They expect that they will make mistakes and they do make mistakes. They teach them to learn from their mistakes but those who are sent into action know that their leaders have confidence in them.

Now if we are going to be perfectly honest about the lay apostolate, a good many laymen go into action and they do not feel that people believe in them. They do not feel that they have the confidence of the priest when they go into action. There are reasons for this and you know the reasons as well as I do. I am not taking an unsympathetic approach. I know the problems of priests too. I have had priests say to me, when I have perhaps gone and talked with trade unionists in their parish: "Well you have got my people all wanting to go into action now but my hair is going to stand on end. I do not know what they are going to say in

the factory tomorrow. I do not know what sort of heresies they are going to be guilty of."

Of course, if you never say a word on behalf of Catholicism, if you never do anything, you are never going to be guilty of heresy—except that that seems to me to almost constitute a heresy in itself. Perhaps it is one of the great heresies of our time.

Learning from Mistakes

There is a calculated risk involved in sending a man into action. But if we can be honest with ourselves, do we never make mistakes? I know perfectly well from travelling in almost every mission area of the world, that lay missionaries go in and they make mistakes. You get all sorts of emotional crises in the first months among some Papal Volunteers and others. You have a percentage of failures. You in the mission societies know that you have your percentage of failures too, despite the seminary training and your religious training. Of course, you have. Human beings make mistakes. You have to be prepared to see the laymen make mistakes just as your superior must be prepared to see you make mistakes.

The important thing is, though, that if the man you send into action is going to make mistakes, he has got to be taught how to learn from his mistakes. Mistakes may be deadly or they may be helpful. Everything depends upon his attitude towards them.

Communists all over the world take the view that mistakes are something you learn from. They are used by them. Mr. Khrushchev makes mistakes but he does not usually repeat them. Our Western statesmen make mistakes and go on making the same mistakes for years on end. That is part of the problem.

It is not by coincidence that this happens. We paper over our mistakes. Its courtesy and all that sort of thing. It is a form of dishonesty too, a form of hypocrisy. The Communists are ruthlessly critical of themselves and of each other because they do not have to bother about matters like Christian charity. They can be really ruthless in their criticism of each other.

Bolshevik Self-criticism

But nevertheless there is something in the idea of coming with this self-critical approach. It is a good one. It is a wonderful antidote to complacency. The Communists have something they describe as Bolshevik self-criticism. This is a very, very meaningful thing to the Communists and it is one of the healthiest and best institutions they have.

I will tell you how it works. You run a campaign, you engage in some form of activity and in the end you have what is called the inquest. In that inquest you are not polite to each other. You do not say: "Sister so-and-so, I think you were wonderful." Oh no! You first of all criticise yourself and say: "Where I went wrong is in such-and-such a way." You are not there to discuss your successes. They can be taken for granted. You say: "I slipped down completely on this, on that, and on the other." Then having criticised yourself, honestly and frankly, you feel entitled to do the same with the other people present. You feel you have a right to do it.

You say: "You went wrong *there* and *you* went wrong *here*. Do you agree?" You discuss the mistakes you all have made. That is good. It is true they do not have to practice Christian charity and so their language is perhaps more severe and sharp — sometimes more blasphemous than we could use. But the idea is a good one and it certainly helps to make their leaders feel that when they send their people into action they need not be too worried about their mistakes because they know that they will set about and try to learn from them.

No Shivering in Silence

I will give you an example of the way this thing works. At the beginning of the last war, I was living in an industrial suburb in London. The population of the town had doubled in, I think it was, the previous six years. This meant that there were two families in almost every house. The accommodations which were provided by the builders for coal was intended for one family, not two. That would create a problem in itself. But the problem became immensely greater at the beginning of the war when we

were changing from a peacetime economy to a war economy. Everything was diverted to the war factories, including coal. In many parts of Britain there was a fuel crisis. No domestic coal got to the domestic consumer; it went to the factories instead.

I was working in London on the *Daily Worker*. I became aware in time that this place where I was living was experiencing such a crisis. No fuel had come into the place for weeks. People had too small a storage capacity. They had used up all their fuel and the winter of 1939-40 was a bitterly cold one. Literally people were living in unheated homes.

I became aware of this, when I had no coal myself, I called the leaders of the local Communist party and said: "There is a fuel crisis hitting the working class of this town really hard. People are suffering. What have you done about it? Nothing at all. The question is what are we going to do? Here is a situation which is just waiting for us to do something". So I write a leaflet. The leaflet said that the people refused to shiver in silence. I said that old people were sitting by empty grates and stoves, sick people were dying in unheated homes—which was true—and that the mass of the people were suffering as a result of this diversion to war industries of the coal which should have gone to the homes of the people. We were, of course, opposing the war effort in our own way. I told the local party's leaders to get the leaflet printed, get it distributed. The leaflet ended by calling on the housewives of that town to demonstrate on Thursday afternoon at three o'clock, to go to the town hall and make their anger known. We had no housewives in the party and so no idea what response there would be. But I said they should have 10,000 copies of the leaflet printed, have them distributed and we would see who turned up.

Housewives Storm Town hall

The most we could hope for was that we might have a typical communist delegation to the mayor, five good, genuine work-class housewives, and Douglas Hyde to keep them on the party line. We went on Thursday afternoon at three o'clock to see who was there. There was no question

of getting a delegation. Ten thousand angry housewives were there. I have been in civil wars, I had been in revolutions but I had never seen anything so frightening. They stormed the town hall. They chased the mayor from his parlour, they went to the fuel office and they did the same to the fuel officer. They broke some windows and they went back home.

On Sunday morning I was trying to get a little bit of extra sleep when I was awokened by the sound of heavy trucks going up and down the street on which I was living and all the neighbouring streets. I pulled back my blackout curtain and I saw that even the men who go around emptying garbage cans were going around delivering coal. The local authority had mobilised every truck in the whole place to deliver coal.

When we had our big demonstration of housewives on Thursday, naturally we played it up on the front page of the *Daily Worker* where it deserved to be a great communist campaign. And you can imagine that in Monday's *Daily Worker*, we had an even bigger story, with bigger headlines, the great victory for which the Communist Party was responsible. The people of that industrial suburb were no longer shivering because they had refused to shiver in silence.

The Inquest

Then came the inquest, when we met as a Party branch to discuss the campaign. In our propaganda we had said it was a great success. What was our verdict at the inquest?

It was a failure! Why? We had demonstrated that the housewives were angry at the situation, that was true. We had ten thousand angry housewives together in fighting mood and then victory had come too easily. Now, we had ten thousand complacent housewives sitting smugly by their firesides, preening themselves and complimenting themselves on what they had achieved. We should have built up class anger; we should have given it a revolutionary content; we should have made some converts to the Communist Party; some new readers for the *Daily Worker*. We had not done it so we wrote it off as a failure.

Best Use of Personnel

The Party believes it is important that you use the human material which is at your disposal just as well as you can. For this reason the Party established a "cadres department" in every country all over the world. So, from the National Executive down to the smallest local cell, you have someone who is called the cadres secretary. He is watching over each individual asking: "How are we combining theory and practice? Are we getting that balance that we want? Are these two opposites being united (this is a sort of dialectical approach) in the life of the individual? Or is Comrade X spending too much time in study and is he becoming some sort of arm-chair philosopher? Is so-and-so just becoming an activist and does not really know what it is all about? Is he forgetting what is the real motivation? If so, he must be persuaded to go to classes." If during the course of the year, he can develop each member of that group in leadership and make him more effective, then it is not a waste of personnel. It is good use of personnel.

Each Communist is brought to a position, as a result of this training, where instinctively he says — without thinking a thing out before he goes into any form of action—"What do I do as a Communist?" Not, "What do I do?" but, "*What do I do as a Communist?*" Is the course I am pursuing a distinctively communist one? Is a distinctively communist approach possible on this occasion? If so, what is it?"

He always thinks as a Communist. When we have reached the point where we have our lay people asking themselves each time before they go into any sort of action: "What do I do as a Christian? Is my approach a distinctively Christian approach to this question?" — we shall be well on the way to making a vastly greater impact than we are making at the moment.

Book Review

Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot by Philip Caraman, S.J.; Longmans, pp. 466, 50s.

THIS can be an appreciation only, for I am no historian; unqualified, therefore, to give this book the kind of scholarly appraisal it so richly deserves. Already, this has been well done by others. Father Caraman has taken to himself in this biography a most difficult period of English history. He has wrapped it round a figure made needlessly controversial by centuries of misrepresentation. Competent reviewers have classified his biography of Henry Garnet as essential reading for future students of these troubled years. This represents the measure of his triumph. It is a big one. For years now, the Armada and the Gunpowder Plot between them have served as rallying points for protagonists of the Whig view of history. The myth of Catholicism as a foreign menace alien to the English way of life was born during these years; so, too, was the legend of the Jesuit as a crafty and sinister agent of papal power, ready to employ any means for the furtherance of Rome's ambition. Those who read Father Caraman's pages objectively will realise the nonsense implicit in these charges. Neither will they stop at this point. They will see them as fabrications deliberately created by the evil men who surrounded the throne of the first Elizabeth and her successor James the First. Their object was to strengthen the crown and, thereby, their own interests which were seen as identical with it. (The same has occurred in our own day in the case of Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany.) They were successful. They and their descendants ruled England for more than three hundred years and grew immensely rich in the process. Their supremacy lasted until the first world war. It went when the flower of England perished with the greatest gallantry in the Flanders mud. I feel nothing but regret for its passing. The myth, however, persisted. The Whig view of history remained to take an increasingly heavy battering in these latter years. The

reception given to Father Caraman's book—if one excludes absurdities like the few disreputable lines written about it in the *Statesman* by the new Master of Balliol—suggests a good deal more than the beginnings of a fruitful change of attitude. To this the book itself will undoubtedly make its own conspicuous contribution.

It would be a mistake to think of this biography as meant only for the specialist. I am not in this category, yet I read every one of its four hundred and forty pages of narrative with an interest bordering at times on excitement. Father Caraman's style, of course, is largely responsible for this. His writing is simple, clear, straightforward and entirely devoid of verbiage. It is impossible for the reader to get lost, even when the author is dealing with complicated details such as, for example, the sequence of events, as they affected Father Garnet, immediately before and after the Gunpowder Plot. The same applies to the interrogations and questioning which followed his capture. The account of these could have been overpacked with detail and rendered boring. The reverse has happened. Father Caraman combines a complete mastery of his material with an ability to present it so clearly that understanding and conviction come without effort. This is a real triumph. He writes with enormous authority, but without heat. The facts, quietly presented by a master of his subject, are allowed to speak for themselves. The style is restrained, even dry at times. There is no obvious attempt to convince the reader. There need not be. The book speaks for itself. Its author writes from strength. As the story unfolds, one knows, without any feeling of being pressurized, that Father Caraman knows everything there is to be known about his subject. Quietly, in page after page, the truth is turned up and allowed to speak for itself. Those who take up this book will find it very difficult to put it down.

There are additional endearing features. Of these, the outstanding one for me is Father Caraman's knowledge of the background against which he writes. He knows Garnet's England. The work and the love of a lifetime have combined to create in these pages a picture of England and

the English as they were at the turn of the sixteenth century. One is enabled to see in both so much that is in evidence today. The characteristics of the people are the same; their reactions almost identical with those of the present day. They were shared by their Catholic countrymen. Patriotism is a case in point. Catholics were conspicuous for it, even when subject to savage persecution at the hands of the Queen for whom they prayed on the scaffold. Never was the word traitor more abused than when applied to these suffering men and women of every class whose only crime was their devotion to the old religion, which the Jesuits and missionary priests worked so hard to restore to the land they loved. It was for their priesthood that these died. Their patriotism was never in doubt. Thereby, they and the laity they served bred a tradition — of devotion to Pope and Crown — which remains to this day as the distinguishing mark of English Catholics. If the second Elizabeth has no more loyal subjects today than those drawn from the ranks of the Catholic body, the reason must be found in the clear-headed, stubborn English fortitude of their ancestors who suffered under the first. Whilst dying at the hands of the Queen, the English martyrs protested their readiness to die for her. What they did refuse, with native stubbornness, was to deny their Faith as a mark of their loyalty to the Crown. The demand that they should do that was in contradiction not only to the claims of their religion, but to the traditions of their country whose Common Law, framed slowly over the centuries and still in process of building, rested on the assumption of every man as his own man, free because national, the equal of his fellows in God's sight and that of the law. Enforced conformity of the sort demanded by the first Elizabeth and her evil councillors was entirely contrary to the English tradition. In their resistance to it, the upholders of the old Faith showed themselves truer to their Englishry than those who tried to force it from them. "I die", said Saint Thomas More at the scaffold in King Henry's reign, "the King's good servant, but God's first". This sentiment was shared by all who suffered after him.

The point is worth taking. The martyrs did not spurn their country when they spurned its new-fangled religion. They showed their love of it the more dearly when they did so.

It makes me all the more sad, in consequence, to learn of Catholics nowadays who are opposed to the canonization of the English Martyrs on the ground that it will upset their non-Catholic countrymen and harm the cause of Christian unity. Unity can only be in truth. How, then, can the cause of those who died for the truth prove a stumbling block to unity? The thinking is wrong; like that which sees the abandonment of patriotism as essential to the establishment of an international order. In reality, the reverse is the case. Nations come together on a basis of mutual regard, which is the fruit of patriotism that is true and held under God. So, too, with ourselves and those we now refer to, rightly, as our separated brethren. We do them no good when we water down the truth for which we stand and the martyrs died. Much depends, of course, on the way we present the truth and here, indeed, we may well have failed in the past. It is for this reason, indeed, that we in England, along with the rest of the Catholic world, must seek for an *aggiornamento*. New contact must be made with our non-Catholic brethren. To be effective, however, it must be made not only in charity, but also in truth. No good will be done to the cause for which we stand if mistakenly, to further its pursuit, we write down the achievement of those who, above all in their dying, showed themselves the supreme embodiment of the values on which alone lasting unity between Christians can be fashioned and made to endure. Father Caraman's masterly biography has added conviction to a thought long present in my mind. It is that the canonization of the Forty Martyrs—of which Henry Garnet was one—is more, not less necessary nowadays than ever before.

Paul Crane, S.J.

SCOOP

Father Paul Crane writes:

Douglas Hyde's name has long been a by-word throughout the developing countries of the world. It is quite typical that, when I phoned him the other day, I found myself talking to a man who had just that moment got back from Malaysia. It is typical also that, on this occasion, he should have granted, at once and so generously, the request I put to him.

It came about in this fashion. I had read with growing excitement a series of eight lectures which he gave, in the summer of 1962, to a gathering of missionaries specially convened for the occasion in the United States. In them, Hyde examined the ingredients of the communist dynamic and compared it with our own; what, in other words, makes Communists tick and Christians falter.

The comparison goes against us. Hence the question, can we take what is good from the communist dynamic and apply it to ourselves? I found Hyde's answer fascinating and of immense value; so much so that I determined to seek his permission to print his lectures as a series in *Christian Order*. I was on the phone to him for this reason. He granted my request at once. The series began in March. Its publication represents something of a scoop.

I do not see how anyone can afford to neglect Hyde's penetrating analysis. We all have to learn the lesson it contains, particularly those at work in the developing countries. Readers of *Christian Order* are asked to cash in on the opportunity presented by this wonderful series and to do all they can to make the magazine more widely known. The price of 12 issues of *Christian Order* is 15s. in England and \$3.00 in the United States. Send subscriptions, please, to the Editor at 65 Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1.

**POPE
JOHN
XXIII** **Journal
of a
soul**

FOURTH printing
already ordered

The only diaries of a pope ever published.

42/-

MICHAEL FOGARTY

**■ under-governed and
over-governed**

'This admirable and luminous book points the way to the "educational state." Its challenging call . . . accords with Christian social tenets.' Catholic Herald.

6/-

YVES CONGAR, O.P.

**■ power and poverty
in the church**

The Church must be seen to be poor and at the service of mankind. Congar reveals the scriptural and theological motives for his belief.

15/-

CARDINAL CARDIJN

■ laymen into action

One of the pioneers of the lay apostolate, Cardijn explains his conception of the person, his sense of mission, his hopes for the future.

16/-

among other authors we publish are:

PAUL VI, GAUTHIER, LEO TRESE

**geoffrey chapman ltd
18 high st wimbledon london SW19**